

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-15 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 5-8 and 15 are allowed. Claims 2, 4 and 9-14 presently stand rejected. The Examiner has indicated that claims 2, 4, and 9-12 contain allowable subject matter, but are newly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Claims 13 and 14 were newly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Roth et al. (3,977,907).

**Analysis**

With respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, Applicants cancel claim 2, thereby rendering this rejection moot. Claims 4 and 9-12 which previously depended from claim 2 have been amended to only depend from allowed claim 1, and therefore, these claims are now believed in condition for allowance.

Turning to claims 13 and 14, amendments to these claims are supported by Figs. 5, 6 and 8 of this application. Therefore, these amendments do not constitute new matter.

Applicants respectfully submit that Roth et al. do anticipate claim 13. Since the battery of Roth et al. has the two spring output terminals (30, 32) rather than a single input-output terminal, this reference does not anticipate present claim 13.

Still further, Applicants submit that it would not have been obvious to arrive at claim 13 based on Roth et al. According to a device consistent with claim 13, a battery does not have a terminal except a single input-output terminal, and therefore, it is possible to solve the problem, which was described in the specification (page 4, line 13 to last line of the present specification), in that a design of an arrangement of terminals on an instrument becomes complicated.

However, the battery of Roth et al. is of such a configuration that there are two terminals as the spring output terminals (30, 32) on the occasion that a battery supplies a current to an instrument, and therefore, two terminals are required on the instrument and a design of an arrangement of the terminals on the instrument necessarily becomes complicated.

Also, Applicants note that the battery of Iwaizano et al. is of such a configuration that a negative terminal is the battery case 90 and a positive terminal is the outer cap 65, and therefore, a design of an arrangement of the terminals on the instrument also becomes complicated.

From the foregoing, according to the invention of claim 13, it is possible to overcome the problem discussed in the pending application, which can not be solved by either Roth et al. or Iwaizono et al. Considering such a level of technology that a positive terminal and a negative terminal, to which a current is supplied, are provided separately on an instrument, it is not conceivable that the invention of the claim 13 is obvious to one skilled in the art.

Turning to claim 14, since the battery of Roth et al. has the spring output terminals (30, 32) rather than a single input-output terminal, Roth et al. do not anticipate claim 14.

Moreover, Applicants note that in Iwaizono et al, a positive terminal is the “outer cap 65” and a negative terminal is the “battery case 90”, and therefore, the single input-output terminal is not configured. Therefore, this reference does not disclose a method including “the step of connecting said battery to said appliance via said single input-output terminal”. From the foregoing, novelty of the claim 14 can not be denied by Roth et al. or Iwaizono et al.

Still further, it would not have been obvious to arrive at the invention directed in claim 14, wherein it is possible to solve the problem that a connecting operation is troublesome, or a

design of an arrangement of terminals on an instrument becomes complicated (see specification beginning at page 4, line 13). This improvement results from the characteristic of "said battery has no terminal except single input-output terminal" in the present claim 14.

Since the battery of Roth et al. has a plurality of terminals, it cannot solve the above-described problem. Also, in the battery of Iwaizono et al., it is of such a configuration that the battery case 90 is a negative terminal and the outer cap 65 is a positive terminal, and therefore, the battery which is disclosed in Iwaizono et al. cannot solve these problems either.

In view of the foregoing, according to a method of claim 14, it is possible to overcome the problem which cannot be solved by the disclosures of Roth et al. and Iwaizono et al. And, considering such a level of technology that two or more terminals are provided in a battery, it is not conceivable that the invention of the present claim 14 is obvious to one skilled in the art.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 13 and 14 are patentable.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/739,326

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Ellen R. Smith  
Registration No. 43,042

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 20, 2004

Attorney Docket No.: Q62363